7. (currently amended). ~~A~~ The plane according to claim 6 wherein said third connectors are disposed on either side of said first modules.

8. (currently amended). ~~A~~ The plane according to claim 6 wherein the length of the device plane is slightly longer than the length of one of said first modules, which are disposed along the length of the device.

9. (canceled).

10. (canceled).

11. (canceled).

12. (canceled).

13. (currently amended). ~~A~~ The plane according to claim 1 wherein said plane is a double sided midplane.

14. (canceled).

15. (currently amended). ~~A~~ The plane according to claim 6 wherein said plane is a double sided midplane.

REMARKS

Objection to the Drawings

In response to the drawings rejection under 37 CFR 1.83(a), the applicant submits that the third modules claimed in claim 6, are illustrated in Figs. 3 -7, and are assigned the reference number 340 on Fig.3. As illustrated in Fig.3 and claimed in claim 6, the third modules are co-linear with the first modules which are centrally placed on the communication device plane. For clarification, the word "third" has been added on page 9, line 15.

Claim Objections

In response to the claims objections on the basis of proper antecedent, the Applicant has amended the claims to conform with the Examiner's objections in this regard.

Claim Rejections based on the Yen Reference:

1. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by the United States Patent No. 5,582,725 (Yen). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position and provides the following explanations to show the difference between claim 1 and the prior art:

   - The first connectors as disclosed in Yen's design of the device plane are **not** longitudinally mounted with regard to the length of the device. In contrast, they extend over the **width** of the device plane not the length . This is clearly illustrated in Fig.4 of the prior art reference.

   - Yen did not suggest nor claim that the second connectors could be placed on both sides of said first connectors. In contrast, Fig. 4 of the Yen patent shows third connectors which are placed in parallel to the first and second connectors (Fig.4 of the Yen patent) on the other side of the first connectors.

2. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 3, the Applicant submit that Yen does not provide an arrangement of connectors that allows maximum module densities. Fig.4 of the prior art shows a plurality of gaps and empty space which are not used. An example of an arrangement that allows for maximum module densities could be found in Figs.2 and 3 of the present invention, where, on the device plane no more space to place an additional connector could be found.

3. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 6, the Applicant submit that the third connectors found at Fig.4 of the prior art are not mounted co-linearly with the first connectors. On the contrary, they are parallel and on the right side of the latter.

4. The Examiner has objected to claim 7 alleging that the third connectors are placed on either side of the first connectors in the Yen's design. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position and asserts that the third connectors of the present invention can be placed on either side of the first connectors, always being co-linear with the latter. This is clearly illustrated in Fig.3 of the present invention. Fig.4 of the prior art shows a different arrangement than the one claimed in claim 7.

5. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 8, the Applicant wishes to draw to the Examiner's attention that the first connectors found at Fig.4 of the Yen reference are mounted in parallel to the **width** of the board which has a rectangular shape. In the present invention, the connectors are mounted lengthwise i.e. along the length of the device. Claim 8 has been reflected to amend this difference. Thus, claim 8 can not be considered obvious with regard to the Yen reference.

6. Claims 9-12 and 14 have been deleted.

Claim Rejections on the basis of the Harenza Reference:

1. The Examiner has rejected claim1 as being anticipated by the United States Patent No. 6,351,719 (Harenza). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position and provides the following explanations to show the difference between claim 1 and the prior art:

   - The first connectors as disclosed in Harenza's design of the device plane are **not** longitudinally mounted with regard to the length of the device. In contrast, they extend over the **width** of the device plane **not the length**. This is clearly illustrated in Fig.1 of the prior art reference which shows the first connectors to be placed by couples in three columns, separated by three of said second connectors which are mounted in parallel thereto. This arrangement is totally different from the design of the present invention. Thus, claim 1 can not be considered anticipated nor obvious in views of the Harenza reference.

   Additionally Harenza does not enclose a design wherein the second connectors are disposed longitudinally with respect to each other. Fig.1 of the prior art shows the

second connectors parallel to each other and co-linear with the first connectors. This is a different arrangement than the one found in claim 1 of the present invention.

2. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 2, the Applicant submits that the prior art design can be read as follows: two first connectors placed in parallel to each other and two second connectors placed longitudinally thereto, and forming together a first column. The second column is shorter than half of the first and could be considered the combination of three second connectors placed in parallel to each other. The third and fifth columns are similar to the first and the fourth is similar to the second. Thus, we can see that when the modules are connected to the connectors the Harenza's design is more likely to have an " m " or "w " shape rather than "H".

3. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 3, in Applicant's opinion, Harenza does not provide an arrangement of connectors that allows a maximum module densities. Fig.1 of the prior art shows a plurality of gaps and empty space which are not used, especially under the group of three connectors which are mounted in parallel to each other. An example of an arrangement that allows for maximum module densities could be found in Figs.2 and 3 of the present invention, where, on the device plane no more space to place an additional connector could be found.

4. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 6, the Applicant wishes to draw to the Examiner's attention that in the Harenza reference a third connecter for connecting a third module does not exist, and what the Examiner considers a third connector is a bus extender different from what is claimed and taught as third connector in the present invention.

5. With regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 8, the Applicant wishes to draw to the Examiner's attention that the first connectors found at Fig.1 of the Harenza reference are mounted in parallel to the **width** of the board which has a rectangular shape. Claim 8 has been amended to reflect this difference.

6. Claims 9-12 and 14 have been deleted.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims overcome all of the rejections outlined in the outstanding Office Action.

It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: G. Ronald Bell

G. Ronald Bell
Registration No. 19,027
Agent for Applicants
G. Ronald Bell & Associates
P.O. Box 2450, Station "D"
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1P 5W6

Date: October 7, 2004